SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. _____

DIGEST OF INTRODUCED RESOLUTION

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION supporting certain actions relating to the collection, distribution, and disbursement of child support in Indiana.

Bray
, read first time and referred to Committee on



1998

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION supporting certain actions relating to the collection, distribution, and disbursement of child support in Indiana.

Whereas, America's children are best served through prompt, accurate, and efficient processing of child and court ordered support payments;

Whereas, A significant number of states, despite due diligence, are having difficulty implementing a statewide computer system for centralized receipt and disbursement of support payments, including the eight large states of California, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas;

Whereas, The Federal Welfare Reform Act of 1996 and previous federal acts and regulations require that each state develop a single, statewide system for tracking child support information transferred from another state. In reality, most states have been unable to identify suitable transfer systems, and the strict interpretation of statewide systems given to the federal legislation by federal regulatory agencies has severely hampered efforts by some larger states to satisfy the federal legislation;

Whereas, Failure to meet the October 1997 deadlines for the state's implementation of automated systems has in many cases resulted from the highly technical and regulatory nature of the child support enforcement program, large caseloads, and the lack of widespread technical and automated resources available to plan and implement 50

1998 SC 2007/DI 76+



state automated systems at once;

Whereas, Many states have had difficulty meeting the current federal regulatory interpretation of the federal legislation and, as a consequence, many states are facing substantial sanctions for their failure to implement statewide automated systems by the Congressional deadline; and

Whereas, Contrary to Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Child Support Enforcement interpretation, Congressional representatives have indicated the Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Child Support Enforcement has the ability to interpret the original Congressional language to grant waivers for the development of multiple and consortium systems with seamless statewide interfaces: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, the House of Representatives concurring:

SECTION 1. That we support attempts by states to encourage Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Child Support Enforcement to review its current interpretation of the federal legislation and expand the description of a single statewide system.

SECTION 2. That we believe that linking and interfacing local depositories through technology is a viable alternative, and that there exists continuing expansion of systems development linking and interfacing independently controlled and operated local depository units. The development of state of the art data interfaces of operational local and state automated court docketing and management systems is recommended. Locally linked and interfaced depository systems present an opportunity for both costs savings in systems development and expansion of customer service based software.

SECTION 3. That we encourage the Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Child Support Enforcement to allow states who fail to meet the October 1997 deadline to develop appropriate five year Corrective Action Plans instead of monetary sanctions.

SECTION 4. That we support pursuing an exemption from the federal legislation with respect to the requirement to implement a central distribution unit.

SECTION 5. That we urge the Legislative Council to reestablish the Centralized System Study Committee, which was created by P.L.257-1997, for a period ending on June 30, 1999.

1998 SC 2007/DI 76+